CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXVI No. 5 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* May, 1985

REFLECTIONS ON V.E. DAY'S 40TH ANNIVERSARY

MOURN, NOT REJOICE!

by ROBERT HUXTABLE

"But what good came of it at last?"
Quoth little Peterkin.
"Why that I cannot tell," said he,
"But 'twas a famous victory."

— *Southey.*

These lines, from a poem by an almost forgotten nineteenth century poet, concern a grandfather who is telling his grandchildren about the Battle of Blenheim, won by the Duke of Marlborough in 1704. In the same way, now that preparations are actively on hand to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the end of the war in Europe, we can look back and ask the same question as "little Peterkin" did.

War, especially modern war, when the instruments of destruction are so terrible and the moral consciousness of mankind so blunted, is such an extreme step to take that theologians hold that four conditions have to be fulfilled to make it just:—

(1) The cause must be grave.
(2) It must be a last resort after all negotiations have failed ("ultima rationem regis" as Louis XIV had inscribed on his cannon).
(3) It must have a reasonable chance of success.
(4) It must not bring about a greater evil than the one it seeks to remedy.

How do these criteria apply to World War II?

We declared war on Germany in September 1939, dragging a reluctant France in our wake, to fulfil our obligation to Poland, whom we had pledged to defend if she were attacked. The pledge was not specifically directed against Hitler, the Agreement of Mutual Assistance of August 25th referring simply to "a European Power". However, Germany was determined to repossess parts of Poland, the Corridor and Danzig, taken from her by the dictated peace of the Treaty of Versailles, in which the population was overwhelmingly German. Despite the gross breach of faith shown by Hitler's march on Prague and annexation of the remainder of Czechoslovakia the previous March, this was not *prima facie* an unreasonable demand and could and should have been settled by international agreement with specific guarantees for the continuing independence of Poland as a whole. So much, however, had public opinion been fanned against Germany that this course of action was impossible. The then U.S. Secretary of the Navy (and later Secretary for Defence), James Forrestal, stated in his *Diaries* (Viking Press, New York, 1951) that the American Ambassador in London told him Neville Chamberlain had complained that "America and the world Jews had forced England into the war."

As a first step, Germany and Russia signed their infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop pact in Augfust 1939 and it is known now that a secret clause agreed on the division of Poland. Accordingly, when Germany attacked, we declared war on September 3rd. However, when Russia annexed Eastern Poland a fortnight later, there was *no* declaration of war against her; the subsequent invasion of Finland and the annexation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia brought nothing more than faint noises of disapproval. It then became obvious that the ostensible reason for declaring war was not the real one.

Stalin's Murderous Character

When in June 1941 Hitler denounced his pact with Stalin and invaded Russia, he drove into the camp of his enemies a state more fundamentally antagonistic to them than he was himself; for bad in some ways as the Nazi regime undoubtedly was, there is no evidence that Hitler wished to subjugate this country or destroy the British Empire. When, in the following autumn, President Roosevelt finally succeeded in involving the United States in the war, there came into existence what Winston Churchill called "The Grand Alliance" — a motley jumble of powers, linked together only by the fact that all were, for different reasons, at war with Germany. Nevertheless, the conflict was depicted as a Crusade (which, of course, it was not, anymore than the War of the Spanish Succession was, of which the Blenheim campaign formed a part), and in order to maintain some semblance of harmony, certain inconvenient facts about the character of Joseph Stalin and his murderous regime had to be buried. Not only had he butchered his political opponents wholesale, but also his supporters and friends when they had outlived their usefulness; he instigated the man-made famine

in the Ukraine and ordered the mass deportation in circumstances of appalling brutality of the inhabitants of the Baltic States in 1940.

It was, therefore, a political necessity to substitute for the real savage and violent Joseph Stalin the caricature of "Good Old Uncle Joe"; a man of sterling qualities if, perhaps, a trifle heavy-handed, but as sincerely devoted to the cause of humanity as any Western democrat could be. By the time of the Yalta agreement in 1945, which set the seal on the post-war partitioning of Europe, this image of Stalin had become an article of faith; were the myth to be exploded, victory would provide little cause, indeed, for rejoicing.

Barbarity And Betrayal

By now, the penalty of defeat had become so frightful that the leaders on both sides considered any act was justified if it contributed to victory; hence the "Final Solution" (expulsion) of the Jewish question by Hitler, and the saturation bombing policy of the Allies. When one considers how that great Dominican, St. Vincent Ferrer, convinced King Henry V during the Agincourt campaign of 1415 that by burning cottages and destroying the crops of the hapless French peasantry he was putting his immortal soul in peril, one realises how much mankind has retrogressed from a spiritual perspective. Barbarity begets barbarity, and it was excessive to hope that at Yalta the Western powers would insist on a fair and just settlement to the war. The aim of Stalin, as it is of his successors, was the spread of Communism, and the conference was the first step towards that end.

What a shameful episode of betrayal it was. Here was confirmed the fatal demand (instigated by Roosevelt, the White House tool of the "American" power elite) for unconditional surrender which ensured that the Germans had no alternative but to fight on. Also, as a result of decisions reached at the conference, at which Roosevelt's chief assistant was Alger Hiss, who later served a term of imprisonment for perjury relating to the fact that he was a communist agent, Allied troops were restrained from taking Berlin and Prague so that the Red Army could penetrate into the heart of Europe. Poland, in whose defence we had nominally gone to war, at the cost of 300,000 British lives, was betrayed. Europe was partitioned, and the British Empire was soon to be liquidated, this being one of Roosevelt's war aims. Indeed, Churchill had rounded on Roosevelt at the Atlantic Charter meeting and declared: "Mr. President, I believe you are trying to do away with the British Empire." The fact that Churchill became Roosevelt's "enthusiastic lieutenant" in that aim further endorses the validity of the accusation.

The effects of the Yalta betrayal can be seen here in the present day, with an uneasy peace between East and West being maintained only by the balance of nuclear terror; hence the efforts of the Communists and their stooges in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament to try to disarm this country unilaterally. V.E. Day marked the enslavement of Central Europe by Stalinism; the 1939-45 war was a triumph of Communism over once free nations stretching from the Baltic to the Adriatic. What, for example, has become of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire of which it was said that if it did not exist, it would have to be invented? As a mediaeval Pope said to one of his Cardinals, "See, my son, with what little wisdom this world is governed." If we are to remember V.E. Day at all, let us do it in sackcloth and ashes.

Editor's note — Mr. Huxtable has asked us to point out that he served through the war in the Royal Engineers and nothing he has written is meant to denigrate the loyalty, devotion and self-sacrifice of countless men and women, both in the forces and in civilian life. Least of all does he wish to criticise in any way those who laid down their lives in the course of duty. We would add for ourselves that while holding no brief for the ill-treatment of any minority, nevertheless we share the scepticism of Professors Butz and Faurisson that the "Final Solution" was as final as most Holocaust "experts" would have us believe.

ANOTHER ANNIVERSARY

The media has afforded us little opportunity to forget that 1985 is the 25th anniversary of the Sharpeville shootings. What isn't mentioned is another 25th anniversary — the massacre in July 1960 of 65 Whites in Stanleyville, Congo, before Belgian paratroopers in from Ascension Island could reach them.

Read
SPEARHEAD
Edited by John Tyndall
Send 63p for a sample copy to:
Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, East Sussex

EUROPEAN UNION — SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Madron Seligman is a banker and a businessman, with a villa on the Riviera: desirable qualifications, perhaps, for a "Euro-M.P." He has held the Sussex West seat since 1979, when the *Jewish Chronicle* applauded the fact that he registered the largest vote of any candidate in the United Kingdom. He was one of the M.E.P.s who committed the treasonable act of voting in favour of the Draft Treaty for European Union. In the *West Sussex Gazette* Seligman contributes an occasional "Letter from Europe", an irritation which prompted *Candour* subscriber Hadley Sendall to take issue with him in the correspondence columns between September and November of last year.

Mr. Sendall entered the lists on September 9th.

DEMOCRACY AND THE PEOPLE'S VOICE

Sir — Ignoring the trivia in Madron Seligman's "Letter from Europe" — both-way holiday-makers, duty-free goodies, etc. — I should like to draw attention, if I may, to his much-vaunted "democracy" and "the Voice of the People", as demonstrated by the European Parliament.

As one of the 68 per cent (a democratic majority, surely?) of those who declined to play any part in stripping this country of its sovereignty, I would like to ask Mr. Seligman if *he* has "learned something from the low turn-out on June 14th." If democratic proceedings can be defined as, and activated by, the votes cast by a minority, no matter how small, be it 32 per cent of 2 per cent, then I suggest that "bureaucratic tyranny" might be a more apt description.

The European Parliament, described by Roger Scruton in *The Times* as one composed of "Social Democrats, Euro-Communists and hysterical radicals, moulded by cranky republican theories", seems a far more accurate description than Mr. Seligman's "Voice of the People".

One more point — the most remarkable thing about Mr. Seligman's "Letter" is the complete omission of any reference to the Draft Treaty of European Union. This document, given the official blessing of heads of government at the Fountainbleau Summit on February 14th, 1984, provides, among other things, for the withdrawal of national passports, a European anthem and flag, and for union law to take precedence over national law. In other words, no more British or Common Law, no more Crown Court, and no more Royal Pardons; in effect, the complete obliteration of that aspect of national identity that characterises the uniquely British ethos.

Finally, Mr. Seligman declares his intention to ". . . press ahead . . . to ensure a better understanding of how our — yes our — Community works." I suggest that 68 per cent of us already know, not only how it works, but why. It works on the basis of majority antagonism for the benefit of its representatives, and because it has about as much regard for democracy as had Attila the Hun.

H. G. SENDALL.

FALSE CRY OF PATRIOTISM

It was only to be expected that this would draw fire from Seligman and a lengthy letter under a double-decker, five-column headline appeared, denouncing Mr. Sendall and his anti-E.E.C. colleague, Bernard Partridge, as "Little Englanders". Seligman's main points are embodied in Mr. Sendall's response, published on November 1st.

Sir — Mr. Seligman's accusation of "rash hysterical distortion" and of waging "phoney intellectual slanging" against his critics lacks the slightest degree of credibility, and reduces his defence to the realm of irredeemable mediocrity; and his attempt to ward off the designation of the European Parliament as one composed of Social Democrats, Euro-Communists, etc. (a *Times* correspondent's words, not mine) by referring to the five member states who still have constitutional monarchs does nothing to enhance his argument, for he knows full well that such monarchs are said to be above politics and cannot influence international agreements — they cannot even prevent their own abolition!

To label opponents of the E.E.C. as "little Englanders" does indeed strike at the heart of the matter, and in the wake of post-war politics is an apt description, not in the Chesterton sense that Mr. Seligman implies, but that it is a state to which we have been reduced willy-nilly. A state, furthermore, which the E.E.C. will further diminish if the Treaty is ratified; and under that same condition, to declare that British Law, Common Law, Crown Courts or Royal Pardons will not be affected, in the face of Article 42 of the Treaty which states: "The law of the Union shall be directly applicable in the member states. It shall take precedence over national law . . . National courts shall apply the law of the Union" is to fly in the face of a declared intention, and I wonder how many of his constituents know that Article 5 notes: "It may in particular acquire or dispose of movable and immovable property." Or that Article 7 declares: "The Union shall take over Community Patrimony."

Mr. Seligman's contention that had a Euro-Community been formed in 1918 World War Two

would have been avoided is a ludicrous piece of "hindsight", for at that time Britain still had an Empire and it would have been an unthinkable act of betrayal to have turned our backs upon our Dominion and Colonial allies who at that time, unlike the post-WWII period, had not had their loyalty to the British Crown undermined. I too, fought in World War Two, as did my father in WWI, but for the opposite motives lauded by your correspondent, i.e. the absorption of this country into Europe, and it is not the slightest use for Mr. Seligman to attempt to deflect the issue of sovereignty by tedious irrelevancies.

Finally, Mr. Seligman declares himself to be a patriot and a democrat, as he very probably is, but he should be warned that this has always been the cry of those, and that of their unconscious tools, who seek to demolish the accepted and traditionally honoured concept of those two qualities.

H. G. SENDALL.

CONCEALED INTENTION

A Mr. M. Bryant joined the fray then with an attack on Hadley Sendall's "negative tone" and a complaint that Britain is "the least E.E.C.-ised member of the community", which our correspondent answered with a third letter.

Sir — Mr. M. Bryant's response to the recent correspondence on the E.E.C. is typical of those who give priority to financial gain over that far more precious asset, national sovereignty.

Your correspondent's reference to the past as being irrelevant in this case exhibits a total lack of historical understanding. History is not merely a record of what is deemed to have happened, written by historians with conflicting views and interpretations. It is a record of what was intended to happen, and intention is far more difficult to identify because the intention is often concealed.

The historical intention is demonstrated quite clearly by the most discernable historical fact, that fact being the formation of larger, and therefore fewer, international political groupings, of which we now have two, commonly referred to as "East" and "West". But to such an extent has the "West" been infiltrated by the "East" the geographical definition ceases to have any real significance and the time of a submerging of all national interests may fast be approaching. Is not the E.E.C. a step in this direction? The only barrier to this is the maintenance of national sovereignty by all nations.

No doubt I shall be accused of further "phoney intellectualism", but I would far rather that charge be levelled than that of "phoney patriotism".

May I conclude with a quotation from Mr. Bryant's namesake, Sir Arthur Bryant, from his intensely patriotic book *The Lion and the Unicorn*?

"It seems strange that, at a time when in so many places — where hitherto the binding force of nationality has meant so little — an almost hysterical consciousness of it prevails, in Great Britain, whose people have for so long been famed for their national pride and cohesion, patriotism has become almost an ugly word . . . Yet in Russia, China [and here he lists the Marxist/Communist countries] patriotism is regarded as the first of social virtues, and treason against one's country and its corporate ideals, even the mildest criticism of them, a crime."

Here, surely, is a clear warning for all well-intentioned internationalists.

H. G. SENDALL.

Another letter appeared from Madron Seligman, but it was nothing more than a dreary reiteration of the arguments already demolished by Mr. Sendall and his anti-Common Market colleagues. As was pointed out in a brief parting shot by Mr. Sendall in early December, they added "nothing but further discredit to the case for craven or self-seeking submission to alien dictates".

TREASON DEMOCRATIC-STYLE

In response to Margaret Crawford's accusation of treason against Mr. Richard Moore, a Liberal/S.D.P. Euro-election candidate, for his support of the Draft Treaty, Mr. David Michael took up the case with his M.P., Mrs. Edwina Currie. She passed the matter on to Sir Michael Havers, the Attorney-General. Sir Michael's reply to Mrs. Currie rejected the charge on the ground that he defined treason as an *un*democratic attempt to change the constitution, which Mr. Moore's election campaign wasn't! "To seek by democratic and constitutional means to bring about a change in the constitution itself," he wrote, "cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, amount to treason. This, of course, is not the law's definition of treason, so Sir Michael is clearly re-defining Parliamentary law to suit himself and thus putting himself above Parliament.

COMMON MARKET SUICIDE

A. K. Chesterton's exposure of the threat posed to the integrity and unity of this country by membership of the E.E.C.

5 for £2, 10 for £3.50 from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

MR. PYM'S DEADLY SILENCE

by A. M. WADE

As we all know, the Rt. Hon. Francis Pym, M.C., M.P., does not agree with the economic policy of the present Government, which is firmly committed to what has been known as Monetarism. His book, *The Politics of Consent,* was published early last year. The following does not presume to be a review of the book but some thoughts arising in the mind of one of his admirers.

Mr. Pym discusses the problems connected with the EEC in which finance figures prominently, as in all national affairs. Rising debts and shortage of money to deal with them are a perpetual hindrance to formulating policies which seem desirable in the public interest, both in the EEC and in our own internal governmental problems of unemployment, heavy taxation, neglect of the infrastructure, deficiency of funds to meet the needs of the Health Service, of Education, and countless other demands for a really satisfactory situation here and abroad. All are dominated by the money system.

The author waxes eloquent about the supremacy of Parliament in our constitution in which any Member may raise any question he wishes — apart, of course, from classified matters — on behalf of any of his electors. This is the theory of our democratic society, but is it true in practice? Parliament, he states, represents the people of Britain; and we learn that Conservatives are not opposed to change. "Their aim has always been to conserve what is good and improve what is bad." That is an excellent principle, but in exercising it they may have been guilty of partiality in deciding good for whom! But the money system itself is never called into question. Are we to conclude that all Members are satisfied with it? Is it not more likely that those who operate it and benefit from its privileged position, of creating the national money supply on their own terms, are averse to any fundamental change?

"A man of large wealth," wrote Walter Bagehot in *Lombard Street,* "however intelligent, always thinks, more or less: 'I have an income and I want to keep it. If things go on as they are I shall certainly keep it; but if they change I may not keep it'."

It cannot have escaped the attention of many Members how ludicrous it is, each year, for the Chancellor to go to the privately controlled banking system for his Public Sector Borrowing Requirement, when his Government possesses the undeniable authority to vote that money, free of debt and interest charges. Hence, it could have carried out the actions urged by Mr. Pym and the other leaders in opposition, without inflation or increased public debt. Where, then, is that freedom of Parliament lauded by Mr. Pym? Why deadly silence about the pivot on which all turns? All the M.P.s who have pressed the case for allowing much needed work to be done, thereby reducing the costs of unemployment pay, have expressed willingness to borrow the balance needed, estimated at around £6 billion, from privately owned institutions which create that credit, and involve the nation in further debt by the Government when that further burden can be avoided.

Swept Under The Carpet

The evasion of this principle of State creation of the money supply is due to the misrepresentation of truth about the relative positions of State and Banks. In 1914, the Bank of England was pleased to be the Treasury lifeboat which printed £300 million in Treasury Notes, which were declared legal tender. Where is the greater financial rectitude — in plunging the State into further unpayable debt, or in rescuing it from oppressive vested interests, and allowing it to exercise its sovereign rights to issue National credit, in which alone lies the real solution of our economic problems? Proposals which had they been properly discussed in the media and in Parliament could have saved much anguish, were advanced fifty years ago, but swept under the carpet. Appeals to reason failed, but a greater force is raising it head today to compel change — the threats of confrontation.

The voices of economists in Britain today seem to be united in allegiance to what goes for orthodoxy. A voice from Canada a few years ago, Premier MacKenzie King, said: "Once a nation parts with control of its currency and credit, it matters not who makes that nation's laws. Usury, once in control, will wreck any nation. Until the control of the issue of currency and credit is restored to government and recognised as its most conspicuous and sacred responsibility, all talk of the sovereignty of Parliament and Democracy is idle and futile."

These great words of self-evident truth, or their like, have been known to our leaders in Church and politics for a lifetime, but totally ignored in both Church and Parliament. Here is the door to economic freedom, but no-one will open it.

THE TRUTH ABOUT "URBAN DEPRIVATION"

by NOEL HUNT

We are frequently told of the awful problem of the city centres. Apparently, they suffer from something called "urban blight" or "inner city deprivation". These dread scourges make people unwilling to live in city centres. They constitute a state of affairs for which we should apparently all feel guilty. This is, of course, not peculiar to England. It is to be found in the United States as well. We are simply told that the phenomenon exists, that we should feel guilty about it, and that money must be found to deal with it. We are never told why it is that people tend to move away from the city centres. Yet there is no great mystery about it.

In America, people — that is to say white taxpayers — move out of areas into which Negroes have begun to move. Rightly or wrongly, the Negro is thought to be a bad neighbour. So people move. So rates and taxes fall off. Negroes are not, in general, noted for their care of property, whether rented or owned. As they move in, the tone of the neighbourhood declines, while all who can move out do so. With less and less spent on home maintenance, less and less available from taxes to pay for urban amenities, "urban blight" comes into being and spreads. School standards and attendances both drop; the crime rate rises.

The situation is much the same in this country. It is odd, indeed, to hear Englishmen complaining about it. They insist that all men are equal, virtually identical, that this is a multi-racial society and that all racial groups must be fully integrated as soon as possible. Holding these views — or at least allowing the talking classes to voice them without overt objection and to attribute the views held by a few fashionable trendies to the bulk of the English people — they yet feel entitled to complain when the coloured races take us at our word, move into our cities and make themselves at home. What else did we expect?

All that has happened is that the immigrants — who, we are assured, "bring rich gifts" — have moved into our cities and made themselves a congenial environment there. Squalor is what you say it is; what we describe as squalor seems comfortable to millions throughout the world. The immigrant has merely made his new neighbourhood as much like the city whence he came as he can contrive. We complain of intolerable over-crowding; to the immigrant this is only cosy. What seems to us an intolerable din is to him a neighbourly and companionable background noise. What seems to us a decent desire for privacy to him means that you must have something to hide. So the English tend to move away. This simply makes the immigrant think that we are doing so on racial grounds. All this, of course, does not mean that our standards are either better or worse than those of the immigrants, only that they are different.

British Standards

As a people, we tend to think that traffic lights should work, that garbage should be regularly delivered. Few other people in the world think that these things are important. Even fewer are prepared to devote thought, time and money to ensuring that these amenities are available. To us, Toxteth and Brixton are fearful examples of urban squalor and "inner city deprivation". To most of their Afro-Asian inhabitants, they are nothing of the sort. They are as close a copy as can be contrived in England of the suburbs in their own country whence they came. Only in such an ambience can they feel at ease, relaxed and at home. The typical English residential suburb makes them as uneasy and uncomfortable as a suburb in Lagos would make us.

While the Empire stood, while trained and dedicated public health departments were in charge, residential areas throughout the world were as close to our ideals as local conditions permitted. The locals went along with our weird ideas on sanitation, hygiene and privacy because they could do no other. Now that the white man has abdicated, the indigenous inhabitants have happily set about making the world more congenial and homelike; or intolerably squalid and filthy, if you happen to think as we do. Under Belgian administration, the Congo boasted superbly laid out towns, kept sparkling and clean and provided with excellent public services. Today, the African lives a tribal life in what were once beautiful homes. He feels no need to attempt to restore the lost standards; indeed, he is for the most part unaware that they have gone. Why should he attempt to restore them? They are not his. He neither wants nor needs them. The same is true of the rest of Africa and of India. It is fast becoming true of parts of Britain.

The "caring" and "compassionate" frequently lecture us on the evils of "urban blight", raising their voices above the screech of the grinding axe.

Education, we are told, is essential: meaning jobs for the boys. Understanding, too, is important: meaning that we must adapt to alien standards and meaning, too, more jobs for more of the boys explaining the new standards. Finally, money is, of course, needed in vast amounts: meaning that the British taxpayer must foot the bill. None of this will do the slightest good, except, of course, to those happy few — many of them immigrants — who draw salaries and move towards index-linked pensions as they waste our time and money pretending that silk purses can be made from sow's ears.

Matters can be put right, of course; but not by men of goodwill, by tolerance or by understanding, unless it is understanding of *our* point of view and a complete disregard of any other. If we wish to see our inner cities restored, then we must insist that our standards, and ours alone, are acceptable. It must be made both expensive and uncomfortable to attempt to live by and other standards. Why we have such standards is not a matter which the immigrant need try to understand; he need only live by them or, if this irks him, return whence he came.

Small hope of this from politicians who make a cult of softness and a public which allows them to do so and taboos any discussion of racial differences. They probably deserve what they are getting in our urban areas. It is possible that what we are suffering from is not "urban blight" or "inner city deprivation", but merely the mark of Cain?

Editor's note — The British taxpayers are not the only ones being fleeced to foot the escalating bill for "urban blight". In South Africa, vast sums are being expended on removing the Bantu shanty towns, only to have the residents riot against being moved from their makeshift shacks to new homes with running water and sanitation. The question of who is going to pay for the millions of rands worth of damage to property caused in the months of rioting is known to be worrying many senior members of the Government, according to Professor Willem Kleynhans, a leading political analyst at the University of South Africa. The distinct prospect of a White backlash is one of the main threats emerging from the endemic unrest in South Africa's black townships, he told the *Daily Telegraph's* Johannesburg correspondent (84/85). "You can be sure that if the whites are expected to make good the damage — only to see it wrecked all over again — there will certainly be a tremendous white backlash," he warned. We hope he is right.

WOOD FOR TREES

The chinless one has come so far,
He even owns a Jaguar!
Once had an army from the pits,
Brave men, albeit such nit-wits,
Choosing the greater none the less
Of evils in this British mess.
Their 'king' sat in a Yorkshire town
The blood-red wine a-supping down
Urging the innocents to starve
Some more before they coal did carve.
Meanwhile a 'queen', quiescently
Took glances so contentedly —
With such mayhem to advertise
Who to notice prices rise
Or witness unemployment swell
Of strangers claiming right to dwell
And softly, softly catching best
Of British wherewithal and nest ?
None but the brave could be so dumb
To let their heritage succumb
To sleight-of-hand and circus trick
Towards a dread monolithic;
With Carta Magna to the flame
And 'Cartel' the name of the game
What price coal — with Culture stick?
Few see the trees with woods so thick!
The miners cried "Hands-off" coal seams
But overlooked their Fathers' dreams
In unity and as one race.
The chinless and the iron-hard
Are opposites in crude charade;
And Hidden Hands to clap the like
Of puppet-play in year-long strike.

B. E. BIGSS.

ZEITUNGSZAR UND ZIONIST

A reader in Germany has sent us a report from the *National Zeitung* (15/2/85) about two old enemies getting together in Jerusalem — Axel Springer, the right-wing press magnate, and Willy Brandt. In the 'seventies, they fought it out tooth and nail. Now, they were attending a meeting of the Socialist International, of which Brandt is Chairman. Although once a Nazi Party member, Springer is a long-standing Zionist and, indeed, is an honorary citizen of Israel and carries a medallion to prove it! So there we have it: a Capitalist and ex-Nazi meeting an International Socialist on the common ground of Zionist Israel. It doesn't make sense — or does it? Perhaps Springer was "exonerated" too!

TRAITOR'S FLAG

Every May, since at least 1981, an alien flag has flown above Exeter Guildhall. The "European" flag, representing the Council of Europe, has been hoisted by the City Council for a week, apparently to symbolise our incarceration in the European Community. When *Candour* reader Robert England protested to the Mayor that the inhabitants of the city had not been consulted, he received no answer. Instead, a letter from the City Secretary and Solicitor, Michael Bransby, denied the foreign nature of the flag and, appallingly, argued that it was "neither necessary nor appropriate" for the Union Jack to be flown at the same time, which Mr. England had requested. He then repeatedly raised the matter with his local councillor, Mrs. Joan Richardson, of 34 Thornton Hill, Exeter, who refused to accept his objection and this year informed him that she was "running out of patience" with his protests!

Of course, it is the birthright of Mr. England, and every other Briton, to have the national flag flying over Exeter Guildhall or any other Guildhall, rather than an alien flag. There is no shame in being proud of one's birthright; the onus is upon those who declare themselves to be "running out of patience" with such a sentiment to prove there is. Other West Country readers are asked to support Mr. England by registering their protests with Exeter's Mayor and Councillor Mrs. Richardson. And if that doesn't work, there is always the example the League of Empire Loyalists set in the 1950s in successfully removing offending United Nations' flags! (Oppropriately these are hung in One World Churches. Ed.)

IN CAHOOTS FOR THE LOOT

Billion-pound trade deals were discussed with Chinese leaders by a delegation headed by Lord Young during a recent visit to Peking. The export mission is the first to China since the Hong Kong sell-out, although under the "Iron Lady's" rule trade with the Communist *bloc* has discernably increased since 1979. Essentially strategic in nature, it makes the Reds stronger and us more vulnerable. The Wimbourne-based Flight Re-fuelling concern, for instance, has just signed a contract with the Chinese for a unique British high-speed target to be used to simulate Exocet and comparable sea-skimming missiles. How right was A. K. Chesterton's crack, when Khruschev threatened to "bury" the West: "Tomorrow the planes will be hurtling towards Moscow with every capitalist manufacturer of excavators begging for a contract."

INTREPID CAMPAIGNER

Candour supporter Edward Atkinson made a stand for public decency in February by removing, after due warning, a poster of a naked woman from a shop in Holloway Road, North London. He pleaded guilty to this "breach of the peace" and freely admitted the material facts of the case, but he told Highbury magistrates that he was simply doing his duty as a citizen. Rather than uphold his action, they bound him over to keep the peace for a year in the sum of £150 and magistrate Mr. David Fingleton had the impertinance to advise him to return to his native Norfolk.

Ted Atkinson is a dedicated and intrepid campaigner. Some years ago he was charged at Hertford Crown Court with damaging a cinema projector during a showing of the obscene film, *Last Tango In Paris*. When he stood trial, he pleaded not guilty, but made no bones about the fact that he had broken the projector with a hammer; his only regret, he told the judge, was that he hadn't used a bigger hammer! He was fined a total of £250, which he promptly refused to pay, and subsequently spent eight weeks in Pentonville.

Any readers who would care to assist Mr. Atkinson with the costs of his latest effort to uphold *moral* law should write to him directly at Marian Cottage, Ely Road, Hilgay, Norfolk.

Buy *American Manifest Destiny and the Holocausts*, Conrad Grieb's incomparably useful collation of documents on the secret history of the 20th century. 388pp. paperback. £5 from Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

The Social Crediter: Issues from December 1964 onwards wanted for our archives. Please send details and prices required to The Candour Library, c/o Candour Publishing Co.

Patriots must buy from each other *Nationalist Scorpionics*, Marks I and II, by Sheila McGovern. £1 each from Albert Elder, 1 Gannet House, 6 Hartington Place, Eastbourne, Sussex.

Nationalist Books for Sale
on variety of subjects from
History to the Novel
Many are rare and out of print
Send S.A.E. to:- **M. J. KENWORTHY**
53 Highcroft Crescent
Glenwood Estate
Bognor Regis
Sussex PO22 8DJ

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.